## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA RENO, NEVADA

STEVEN BRAUNSTEIN; et al., ) 3:10-CV-00051-ECR-VPC

Plaintiffs,	MINUTES OF THE COURT
vs. )	DATE: July 30, 2010
DAVID ROGER, DISTRICT ATTORNEY FOR ) CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA; et al.,	
Defendants. )	
PRESENT: EDWARD C. REED, JR.	U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE
Deputy Clerk:COLLEEN LARSEN	Reporter:NONE APPEARING
Counsel for Plaintiff(s)	NONE APPEARING
Counsel for Defendant(s)	NONE APPEARING

## MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS

On May 20, 2010, the Magistrate Judge filed a Report and Recommendation (#24) recommending that Defendants' Motions (#3 and #5) and Plaintiffs' Motions (#9 and #10) be denied as moot in light of the dismissal of the Complaint (#1).

Plaintiffs filed Objections (#25) to the Report and Recommendation (#24) based in part on the claim that they have sued the district attorney as a representative of Clark County, Nevada and that the judges in this case are not entitled to absolute immunity because they acted in the clear absence of jurisdiction. The Objections (#25) are without merit. In particular, we note that the district attorney may not be sued as the representative of the county and the judges in this case did not act in clear absence of jurisdiction.

 ${\tt IT\ IS,\ THEREFORE,\ HEREBY\ ORDERED}$  that the Report and Recommendation (#24) is  ${\tt APPROVED}$  and  ${\tt ADOPTED}$ .

 ${\tt IT\ IS\ FURTHER\ ORDERED}$  that Plaintiffs' Complaint (#1) is  ${\tt DISMISSED}$  in accordance with the screening order which is contained in the Report and Recommendation (#24).

## Case 3:10-cv-00051-ECR-VPC Document 30 Filed 07/30/10 Page 2 of 2

	ΙT	IS	FURTHER	ORDERED	that	Motions	(#3,	#5,	#9,	and	#10)	are	DENIED	as
moot.														

The Clerk shall enter judgment accordingly.

By /s/
Deputy Clerk